



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

natural resources for the benefit of its citizens, or of that portion interested. This doctrine was the justification for allowing the state to appear as plaintiff in the recent cases for the protection of a state's resources from acts outside. *Georgia v. Tenn. Copper Co.*, 206 U. S. 230; see 21 HARV. L. REV. 132. How far a state may protect its resources from acts within its territory is still unsettled. Statutes similar to the one in the case, providing the terms on which gas, oil, and animals *ferae naturae* can be reduced to possession and so become private property, have been upheld. Thus, statutes preventing the killing of game to be taken outside the state and preventing the acquisition of gas for wasteful use are constitutional. *Geer v. Connecticut*, 161 U. S. 519; *Ohio Oil Co. v. Indiana*, 177 U. S. 190; but *cf. Manufacturers, etc., Co. v. Ind., etc., Co.*, 155 Ind. 545. But when such resources become private property by being reduced to possession, it would seem that the ordinary rules of the rights of property owners exist. See FREUND, POLICE POWER, §§ 422-3.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW — PERSONAL RIGHTS — PEONAGE. — A South Carolina statute provided that any farm laborer working under a contract who should receive advances and thereafter wilfully fail to perform the contract, should be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment. *Held*, that the statute is invalid, since it violates (1) the state constitution prohibiting imprisonment for debt; (2) the Thirteenth Amendment prohibiting involuntary servitude except as punishment for a crime; (3) the Fourteenth Amendment prohibiting the denial of equal protection of the laws; and (4) 14 Stat. at L. 546, abolishing peonage. Six justices dissented. *Ex parte Holman*, 60 S. E. 19 (S. C.).

For a discussion of the principles involved, see 17 HARV. L. REV. 121.

COURTS — JURISDICTION ON HOLIDAYS. — A statute prohibited certain judicial proceedings on holidays. Such proceedings were had in violation of the statute, but the relator failed to object. Later a judgment, based in part upon such proceedings, was entered on a judicial day. *Held*, that such judgment will not be set aside. *State ex rel. Walter v. Superior Court of Whitman County*, 94 Pac. 665 (Wash.).

It is generally held that when a statute creates a legal holiday but does not expressly prohibit judicial proceedings, such proceedings, held on that day, will not be void if no objection is taken at the time, though it is probable that if objection is raised at the proper time the court cannot compel the parties to proceed. *State v. Moore*, 104 N. C. 743. But where the statute expressly forbids the holding of court on a certain day, such day becomes *dies non juridicus*, and any proceedings held in violation of the prohibition will be void, regardless of whether or not objection was raised at the time, since the court is without jurisdiction. *Davidson v. Munsey*, 27 Utah 87. The present case seems to fall within the latter rule, and, since the court was without jurisdiction, failure to object at the time should have been immaterial, for a jurisdictional objection may be raised at any stage of proceedings. *Fowler v. Eddy*, 110 Pa. St. 117.

COVENANTS OF TITLE — COVENANTS OF SEISIN AND WARRANTY — BREACH BY POSSESSION ADVERSE TO GRANTOR. — The defendant conveyed land to the plaintiff with covenants of seisin and warranty. Subsequently the defendant sued A, who was in possession in ejectment. A set up possession for the statutory period and prevailed. *Held*, that there is a breach of both covenants. *Larson v. Goettl*, 114 N. W. 840 (Minn.).

When a possession adverse to the grantor has ripened into an indefeasible right at the time a conveyance with a covenant of seisin is made, the covenant is undoubtedly broken. *Wilson v. Forbes*, 2 Dev. (N. C.) 30. On principle it would seem that any possession adverse to the grantor should constitute a breach. See *Thomas v. Perry*, 1 Pet. (U. S. C. C.) 49. But there is some authority that a mere tortious possession does not come within the covenant. *Ferritt v. Weare*, 3 Price 575. In the present case, however, it does not appear whether or not, at the time of the grant, the adverse possession had continued for the statutory period. With regard to covenants of warranty, a distinction is un-